

November 7, 1969

Approved For Release 2002/05/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000500020002-9
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S13943

our best to blame it on you and get as many people as possible against you for it."

One of the marks of operative political freedom is the liberty to louse up your own cause by poor judgment and bad tactics. We've been over this again and again with the blacks, who've insisted that a white man can't general a black man's cause. If the cause is lost the black man must pay; the same holds true for the peace movement, which essentially is a young people's movement because the burden of the war falls heaviest on them.

Another category of remarks and admonitions centers around "sincerity." There are a number of variants but the gist is, "If you want to prove your sincerity, you won't march on the grass without a permit, you will submit to arrest and go to jail, or you will act responsibly, i.e., you will do what we want you to do."

If sincerity were a test in politics, nine out of ten public officeholders would be turned out tomorrow morning. Sincerity is a private virtue, and people who demand it only demand it of their enemies. If you disagree with me, the only way I'll believe you're sincere is if you change your mind and join me.

Next we have the double-mouthed critic who wants to get a leg up on both sides. He likes to say, "Your cause is fine, noble, generous and public spirited, but your leaders and/or some of your followers are terrible. Why don't you throw out the Communists, radicals, activists, and lunatics on your steering committee, and pick some good, moderate, middle-of-the-road, responsible people?"

Politics is tough enough without each side letting the other pick its leaders. The blacks have had to suffer through this again and again—"We're for equality, but we won't negotiate with militants." Often what this translates into is, "We don't mind you messing around as long as the people leading you are compliant and ineffective, but we don't want you being influenced by some bunch that knows what it's doing."

There is a degree of seeming plausibility to this criticism. Some of us are jarred and disconcerted when we learn there are two Communist Party members on the board of a local peace committee. For people who fear violence, the presence of CP members should be reassuring. Old line Reds tend to be lawn-order types who're as suspicious of unsupervised, popular demonstrations as any White House aide. But the point is that there is no way to bar the door to Communists or SDS members or Trotskyites because the peace movement is a movement not a political party.

In American politics the parties are run by one half of one per cent of the membership—the silent minority, you might call it—so they can control what kind of person is allowed into influential positions. A social movement, by definition, is a different species of animal. It has no stability, it shrinks and swells, it takes cues from people in leadership positions, but its awesome strength derives from the millions of individuals making up their own minds to join in. This is why the government can continue to indict leaders without any visible effect on the movement's strength. It is not controlled by tiny numbers of people who have power to keep out Communists but admit moderates.

Most of the people who will be coming to Washington next week won't know the names or politics of the people who thought up the idea of the moratorium or the march. The marchers are led not by leaders but by an idea. Leaderlessness isn't a characteristic of all mass movements, but it's an important element in this one because it heightens the feeling of uncertainty surrounding what may happen. Under other circumstances, there would be political figures in Washington to act as leaders, but most of the logical candidates for leadership roles either have discredited themselves or will be too chicken to stand on the speaker's platform.

Another argument you frequently hear is,

"If you do this there may be violence and the blood will be on your hands." Sometimes that's true, but if we look at the history of civil conflict in the United States it's clear that often the responsibility for blood being shed has to be assumed by the authorities. Flirtatious delays in issuing parade permits, the use of agents provocateurs are instances of officials inciting to riot. In the last few days it hasn't been the antiwar leaders who have crossed state lines to give kid-baiting, incendiary talks and you know these speakers aren't going to be indicted under the Rap Brown Act.

For a demonstration to remain peaceful, there must be lawful conduct both from the marchers and the authorities. If it's true that violence will hurt the peace movement, then there are others besides a few demented kids from SDS who stand to gain by fulminating it.

Next we get to the unity-divisiveness theme. Somebody gave a classic expression of it on the tube the other night: "Let us be united for peace. Let us also be united against defeat. Because let us understand: North Vietnam cannot defeat the United States. Only Americans can do that."

It is by uttering such words, especially behind the presidential shield, that a "silent majority" is created. A silent majority is a large, flaccid glop of people who thoughtlessly give assent because the question doesn't matter enough to them to think it through. People are silent because they are gagged, despairing or indifferent. This majority is silent because it doesn't care enough.

Taken on their face, these calls for unity make no sense, but they're comprehensible if you understand unity to mean obedience—"Be obedient for peace. Be obedient against defeat." Except in rare moments of self-evident, not government-proclaimed, national crisis, unity is antithetical to the democratic process. Our whole theory of ruling ourselves is based on the assumption that rival ideas and policies must be encouraged to have it out so that we may pick the wisest and best.

We've had 30 years of unity, of bipartisan foreign policies, of obediently cheering while our presidents roam infinitely about the planet, lamp in hand, like Diogenes, trying to find a peaceful nation. An end to unity. Bring on division and debate. It's terrible on the ears and the nerves, but it's never been claimed that democracy is the easiest form of government, only the best.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE MORATORIUM

Citizens may disagree with official policy, even in time of war, and still be patriots. But they must be free to express their disagreement. Dissent that is suppressed tends inevitably to become rebellious, just as any force too narrowly confined tends to become explosive. That is why protest against prevailing policy—even when a President feels that it may hamper the execution of that policy—needs to be accorded the fullest freedom consonant with public safety.

Nothing is clearer from the Constitution and the traditions of the American people than that citizens have a right to come to the Capital of the United States and demonstrate dramatically to their representatives in Congress and to their President that they oppose a national policy. It is true that such a demonstration may cause a lot of inconvenience; it may snarl traffic, interfere with people engaged in their normal activities, put the government to great expense in maintaining order. But to forbid or frustrate such a demonstration would be at once dangerous and un-American in the truest sense of that abused term.

We set forth these general observations with the thought that they ought to guide the government in dealing with the antiwar demonstration planned here for Nov. 13, 14 and 15. It would be folly to ignore the potential dangers involved in this demonstra-

tion. No one can say with any certainty how many demonstrators will come here. No one seems able to speak with authority for the demonstration as a whole. While there is no doubt that an overwhelming majority of those who will assemble here mean to do so peaceably, there is evidence that others mean to take advantage of the occasion to foment disorder and violence; and there is always a risk that excitement can lead to upheaval even among the well-meaning.

So there is every reason for the District authorities and the Department of Justice to take precautions and to be prepared to deal with trouble. The sooner the rules governing the demonstration can be clearly fixed and made widely known, the better the chances for avoiding disaster. Those rules ought to be generous and reasonable. In a statement Tuesday night, Justice Department officials indicated that they want to scale the Nov. 15 march down to a "symbolic" movement of a few people. There is no warrant for such constraint. Pennsylvania Avenue is a traditional place for parades; and there is no good reason why the demonstrators should not use it if they do so lawfully and in good order.

The aim ought to be to maximize the opportunities for orderly expression, while minimizing the opportunities to foment violence. If there are to be several hundred thousand demonstrators here next week, there is good reason for forbidding them to ring the White House itself because of the dangers that grow out of confining so large a number in so small an area. But they could safely, we should suppose, be allowed to march around the complex comprising the White House, the Treasury Department and the old State, War and Navy building.

Latitude and hospitality in dealing with demonstrators worked well for this city in the great Civil Rights March of 1963, in the creation of Resurrection City and in the Moratorium Day of last month. They worked a great deal better than the hostility and repression with which the Chicago authorities greeted the demonstrators at the Democratic National Convention of 1968. Local as well as national authorities ought to participate in the planning for this event, for local as well as national interests are involved, and the people who live here need full representation.

Specifically, both Mayor Washington and the city council ought to be speaking out and exerting their influence in every way possible, publicly as well as privately, to maintain the record that has been established here of respect for liberty as well as order.

Let the rules be respectful of freedom. Let them be promulgated with as much clarity as possible. And let the force be on hand to see that they are resolutely maintained. The Americans who live here need not then be fearful of fellow-Americans who come to the Capital to exercise their right as free men.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 514,

H.R. 12307. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12307) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no consideration will be given to the pending business this afternoon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

It is my intention, when the distinguished Senator from Alaska completes his remarks, to explain to the Senate in a somewhat brief manner, with additional brief information to be incorporated in the Record, the status of the consular convention with Belgium and the agreement with Canada on adjustments in flood control payments.

It will be my intention to go through the reading of these two treaties or agreements and to request at that time that the vote take place at 2 o'clock Monday afternoon next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of yesterday, the Senator from Alaska is recognized for 30 minutes.

S. 3127—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE EXCHANGE OF GOVERNMENTAL OFFICIALS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3127) to provide for the exchange of governmental officials between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, introduced by Mr. GRAVEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SAINTS AND DEVILS THRIVE ON DISTANCE

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, the time has come for the American political leadership to visit the Soviet Union. And the time has come for the Soviet political leadership to see what the United States is really like. The time has come to do what perceptive political observers have long proposed. We should expose each country to the observation of the political leadership of the other side.

I propose that we make it possible for 1,000 leading American elected officials in local, State, and National Government to go to the Soviet Union with their wives for up to 2 weeks at Government expense. And I propose that we facilitate the travel here of 1,000 members of the Soviet leadership with their wives,

should they choose to come. This proposal has potential for improving relations, and for providing a political climate in which the arms race can be slowed. Certainly, relations between our two countries will become more normal when such visits become an accepted state of affairs.

There are two aspects of my proposal and both deserve support on their merits alone.

First, there is the enormous desirability of having our political leaders visit the Soviet Union. Consider what a strange state of affairs now exists. Since the Second World War \$1 trillion has been appropriated principally for our defense against the Soviet Union. Yet most Congressmen and Senators who cast their votes have never been there. Appropriations continue at such a rate that in the next 10 years, we will have spent an additional trillion dollars. No Senator or Congressman spends one-millionth of that sum without going to see the site of the dam or airport for which the money is being spent.

Every Congressman bears direct responsibility for decisions affecting the conduct of defense and foreign policy. Each must consider his vote on defense matters to be among the most important votes he casts.

In our political process decisions are not only made in Congress. Elected officials at the State and local level also shape national policies through their influence on candidates and issues. How many mayors, Governors, and leading members of State legislatures have been to the Soviet Union? And how many of these officials will be tomorrow's national leaders?

Everyone who has been to the Soviet Union—everyone who has traveled anywhere—knows the importance of a visit in understanding another culture. Sociologists, specialists in cultural exchange, political and social scientists will tell us that there is no substitute for travel as an educational and cultural addition to the perspective of our political leadership. Some believe we are entering an era of educational and cultural relations which itself must be better understood by our political leadership.

Every year since 1953, we have sent to the Soviet Union between 500 and 3,000 scientists, sportsmen, doctors, educators, and specialists of other kinds. Has not the time come to send political leaders who must, after all, make the decisions upon which our future depends?

In recent years, between 10,000 and 20,000 American tourists have gone to the Soviet Union annually. In time, an informed portion of our American society will have a clearer mental picture of the Soviet Union than that held by most American political leaders.

In the beginning of the cold war, travel to the Soviet Union was difficult and hedged with restrictions. But since the middle fifties, and increasingly in the sixties, many cities have been opened up for even nonofficial travel.

Mr. President, I returned in August from a short visit to Moscow. I can tell you what many thousands of Americans can now report first hand. It is possible to walk the length and breadth of these

many cities. It is possible to see the way people dress, the homes they live in, the newspapers and posters they read, the monuments they visit. One can see how they treat one another, the courtesies they show the visitors and the emerging and disappearing styles of behavior.

We in the Congress are politicians. We are good ones, or we would not be here. We know the importance of seeing, feeling, touching, smelling reality. We know what reaching out to people is like. We know how much can be learned and gained from experience. And we know how important it is to let others see us, and hear from us, what we stand for. Why, then, have we failed to apply this rich instinct for human relations to foreign affairs, our most important problem?

There is no good reason. Some Congressmen and Senators have already traveled—some more than once—to the Soviet Union. And they can testify, as I testify, to the importance of such travel in their thinking and perspective. But many other Congressmen and Senators have never found the occasion. Some are inhibited by shortages of time. Some are inhibited by fear of the charge of "junketing." They do not wish to ask a committee for funds for travel when that travel is not imperative to that particular committee assignment.

Not only Congressmen should visit the Soviet Union. It is abundantly clear today that there must be continual examination and reexamination of our national priorities in our national expenditures. The needs of our States and our cities must be balanced against the demands of national security. Fully one-half of our budget is being spent on defense. In the attitudes and in the positions taken by State and local leaders there are always echoes of opinions of the cold war. Whether he wants roads, schools, or health care, each State and local leader should want to have an informed appraisal of the kind of adversary we face.

Therefore, our 50 Governors should be given an opportunity to visit the Soviet Union. They especially provide the citizens of their States with a sense of the relative urgency of domestic versus defense expenditures.

Inside the State legislatures, where the political process is shaping domestic programs, it is desirable that respected men of long experience be available to convey their sense of the state of Soviet progress. In our Nation, there are 99 houses of the State legislature. Each has a speaker or president and each has a majority and minority leader. I propose that these three men in each of these 99 parliaments be given the same opportunity to travel.

Finally, I believe that we should accord the same privilege to the mayors of our 100 largest cities, cities with well over 100,000 population and sometimes several million. These mayors are also urgently seeking some personal basis for shaping the national priorities that are so critical to the demands of their cities.

In other words, this program would insure that leading and representative figures throughout our political process

November 7, 1969

had some firsthand experience with the most salient features of Soviet life.

Obviously, a proposal this far reaching and novel will need continual overseeing. Discussions with Soviet representatives about the program will undoubtedly be necessary. And Congress will want to be ready to hear U.S. and Soviet comments on how the program is going. Therefore, I am proposing that a Joint Committee on U.S.-U.S.S.R. Political Exchanges be set up for the explicit purpose of overseeing this program. It would have no other purpose.

This is a sensible proposal. And it is an idea whose time has come. The proposal can be justified in many different ways and does not assume an improvement in United States-Soviet relations. Some may wish to be certain that their perspective on Soviet development is accurate and up to date. Some may believe that one should "know one's adversary."

This is not a proposal to brainwash the American political leadership. Historically, those most sympathetic to the Soviet Union have been disillusioned by their visits. In 1936, Andre Gide's report on his trip "Return from the U.S.S.R." created a sensation. Three years before, Gide had declared his "admiration," his "love" for the Soviet Union. He returned deeply troubled and said:

Good and bad alike are to be found there; ... the best and the worst.

He was not the first. In 1839, a contemporary of De Tocqueville, Nicholas de Custine, produced an extraordinary report on his visit to Russia. His insight into Russian character is as valuable as De Tocqueville's analysis of our own. De Custine reported that he went to Russia "in search of arguments against representative government" but returned a "partisan of constitutions." These observers were far more sympathetic to what they set out to see than our political leadership would be.

Our political leadership cannot be fooled. It is true that the Soviet leadership, and Soviet society both, will try to show visitors only the best, much as a housewife insists upon tidying up the home before guests are received.

And of course, for traditional social and political reasons, the Soviet Union wants to make the best possible impression on foreign visitors. But this makes no important difference. Many differences between American and Soviet ways of life are so visible that they cannot be hidden from the traveler for even 30 minutes, much less 2 weeks.

It is not only the political left that is traditionally disillusioned by contact with the Soviet Union. The far right will also be startled. The Soviet Union is far behind us in living standards. They will see that the Soviets are not 10 feet tall.

There is much evidence that the more conservative the American politicians are, in economic and political philosophy, the more favorably impressed they are likely to be by the Soviet Union.

In other words, some of our political leaders with exaggerated stereotypes will lose them. This is not brainwashing. This is broadening. This is education. People often fear and often they idolize what they do not know. That is what Dr.

Harold Lasswell meant when he said: "Saints and devils thrive on distance."

My proposal that we arm ourselves with information, is something we ought to do in our own interest. We should do it regardless of the Soviet response. But obviously, it is just as important for Soviet officials to see our country as it is for us to see theirs. We should not forget that only one group in the world has the power to destroy us and this is the ruling group in the U.S.S.R. Whether we communicate well with that group could, quite literally, determine whether we and they survive.

The best way to improve such communication is to remove Soviet stereotypes about us and permit this group of leaders to see us as we are. An important study, entitled "How the Soviet System Works," lists typical Soviet opinions and the effect of contact with the West on those opinions. Soviet citizens thought Americans were aggressive and bent on world domination. But contact with the West decreased the force of that belief. Soviet citizens respected America for its technology and its material power; contact with the West reinforced this view. Soviet citizens thought capitalism was decadent, surviving only by exploitation of workers, and the artificial stimulation of armament production. This notion has been pretty well destroyed by contact with the West. Finally, our standard of living was underestimated. The magnitudes of difference that did exist surprised Soviet citizens who came here.

But perhaps most important of the impressions that visits to America will leave in the minds of Soviet officials is the impression that an arms race with a country so rich is so futile. This alone is reason enough for the passage of this bill.

My proposal is not the first effort by the United States to welcome foreign leaders in our political interest. In 1948, Congress passed the International Information and Educational Exchange Act, better known as the Smith-Mundt Act. At first this was directed toward encouraging visits by intellectuals and scientists. It then became, under the pressures of the cold war, a program to convey a more accurate picture of American democracy to foreign leaders in the massive struggle for men's minds.

Thus, the foreign leader program of 1952 was designed for those who exercised, or would probably soon exercise, unquestionable influence over a substantial segment of public opinion in their own countries. They were to be provided with a full and fair picture of American life.

From 1949 to 1954, a great emphasis was placed on exposing German leaders to American democracy. Are we any less interested in showing America to the Soviet leadership with its power of war or peace, than to the leadership of a defeated Germany?

Unfortunately, negotiations on Soviet visits of this kind could bog down through Soviet reluctance to send their leadership in these numbers. This proposal may seem frightening to many Soviet leaders of conservative bent who fear ideological penetration and do not

wish to have so many of their colleagues exposed to Western influences and Western standards of living.

For this reason, the United States should simply move ahead on that part of the program that it can control by itself—the sending of our political leaders to the Soviet Union. The best way to insure Soviet participation is not to wait for their agreement.

I propose that, in passing this bill, we announce our readiness to welcome 1,000 Soviet officials from the Communist Party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers.

The proposed Joint Committee on U.S.-U.S.S.R. Political Exchanges, through the U.S. State Department, can discuss with the Soviet representatives any proposals they may wish to make about financial reciprocity. It is entirely possible that we shall wish to defray Soviet expenses in this country, and in return have the Soviet Union defray the expenses of our visitors. This is a minor question, from our point of view.

The exchanges between officials of the two societies is not an exchange between the Congress and the Supreme Soviet. It is obviously much broader than that. The fact that our political figures participate in our social system in different ways than the Soviet figures participate in theirs does not constitute a valid basis for rejecting this program.

We can reasonably assume that, for the most part, the most influential Soviet political figures will be sent. After all, a trip to the West is interesting to Soviet citizens just as a trip to the Soviet Union is interesting to our citizens. There will be some competition over who is permitted to take advantage of this offer: presumably the most influential will win. But it does not matter. All who are sent will be important figures and opinion leaders in the Soviet Union. All should see us as we really are. We have nothing to hide and much to be proud of.

Many Members of the Congress may fear that such an exchange will require enormous quantities of official hospitality and time—resources of which parliamentarians in our social system have very little. But this need not be so. There are private institutions quite capable of arranging the appointments and visits of the 1,000 Soviet visitors who may come.

Most of the visitors will be interested in seeing the country rather than exchanging speeches. Anyone who has accepted official hospitality in trips to the Soviet Union may wish to reciprocate. But no individual will be under any obligation. We do not want this program to disintegrate into a series of ceremonial events, this would be inconsistent with the basic purpose of the program. Every effort will be made to keep such events at a minimum.

Finally, my program includes the spouses on both sides. The purpose of this proposal is to observe the life of another society. In this evaluation, women have an important perspective.

The wives will observe important aspects of life that would otherwise be missed. The wife provides a useful, trusted, and valued sounding board on which to test his conclusions. Our wives give balance to our views.

S 13946

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 7, 1961

Some will say that if we spend money for travel to the Soviet Union, why not other countries?

I see a special relevance in visits to the Soviet Union, the only other really major power, a nation that has 1,000 missiles aimed at us. So I restrict my proposal to this country.

Not all of what travelers learn is good. But all of it is real. A picture is worth a thousand words. A visit is a million pictures. No one can be sure, using words alone, that his judgment on Soviet policy is sound, unless he has exposed himself to at least one visit. This, in a nutshell, is my argument.

The total cost of this program would be \$5 million. Let me recapitulate what we are getting for this sum. One thousand influential officials of our society, with their spouses, will be exposed to the Soviet Union as it is. Each will be in a position to transmit, through his vote, and to the groups he influences, exactly what he has learned.

And, in addition, we will likely trigger from the Soviet Union visits of 1,000 influential persons and their wives from their society. They would see us as we are.

Defense expenditures over this period of 5 years are likely to be at least \$350 billion or about \$1,500 per person in the United States. My program will cost less than 2 cents per person over the same 5-year period. If we and the Soviet Union cut our defense costs some infinitesimal amount as a result of this exchange, the entire project will have been a success.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAVEL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is a most interesting speech. It raises a very intriguing question.

The question of exchanges between parliamentarians has been brought up from time to time, and I believe that the Soviet Union has indicated great interest in bringing about an exchange between parliamentarians from their country with Members of Congress in this country. So far this proposal has not achieved importance in the way of success because, I think, of the inherent or latent hostility which is still a factor between the two countries and which will not be relieved until better relations are achieved.

I wish to ask the Senator a few questions which may help to indicate his particular interest in the intriguing possibility he has raised.

Aside from Canada and Mexico, what country is our closest neighbor?

Mr. GRAVEL. Geographically, it is the Soviet Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the status of the Diomed Islands; and what is the distance between the two islands?

Mr. GRAVEL. Between Little Diomed, which is U.S. territory, and Big Diomed, which is Russian, the distance is about 2 miles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So the largest State in the Union is the closest neighbor to the largest nation in the world.

Mr. GRAVEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Many people are not aware of the fact that we are a very close neighbor of the Soviet Union, based on the distance between these two islands. As the Senator indicated, 2 miles separate the United States from the Soviet Union. I bring out this point because it helps explain in part why the distinguished Senator from Alaska, who, in effect, is a next-door neighbor, would be interested in a suggestion of this kind.

I want to assure the Senator, assuming that this matter will go before the Committee on Foreign Relations, as I think it will, that what he has suggested will receive every consideration and, hopefully, in the not too distant future.

I commend the Senator for a most interesting speech.

Mr. GRAVEL. I thank the Senator from Montana very much.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRAVEL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I found the speech of the Senator from Alaska most interesting. I thought his presentation was splendid.

I am not prepared at this time to endorse the specifics of the legislation which the Senator is introducing today but I find his idea intriguing.

I endorse the central theme; namely, the importance of individuals, particularly the leaders of a country knowing better the leaders and conditions in other countries. I think that is extremely important.

Mr. President, in private life and before coming to the Senate, I was a newspaper editor. I felt it an obligation to know not just my circulation territory, but I also felt it an obligation on the part of those in the news gathering and news publication business to know the conditions existing throughout the world. Therefore I made it a special point of frequently going to a particular country or countries. I found to be of tremendous benefit.

I think that is what the distinguished Senator from Alaska has in mind when he seeks to encourage an exchange of leaders of government between the two greatest nations in the world, the United States, and the Soviet Union.

I concur in his view that not all of what travelers experience is good. But I like his words, "But all of it is real." I like what he says, "A picture is worth a thousand words." As a newspaper editor, I certainly agree with that.

Then he says, "A visit is a million pictures." I think that is a beautiful phrase he has used and one with which I fully concur.

Mr. President, I do not think that we can best grasp the problems on which we have to legislate in Congress when we have had first-hand experience.

I remember vividly when Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba—January 1, 1959—just a little over 10 years ago.

I remember that many of the great newspapers in this country told the American people what a great liberator Fidel Castro was, that his coming to power would give freedom to the Cuban people, who, prior to that time, had been

under the domination of Batista and his rather corrupt regime.

With that in mind, and because I did not approve of the corruptness of the Batista regime, I went to Cuba in the early days of Castro's coming to power. I wanted to see for myself just what kind of individual he was and the conditions that were developing in Cuba.

I went to Cuba several times during 1959. It did not take me long to learn that what we had read in the influential press in this country, particularly one paper in the city of New York and various news magazines was completely inaccurate.

It was in October of 1959 that I stood in the public square at the Presidential Palace in Havana, with a crowd which Cuban officials had estimated to be 1 million persons, they had converged on the Presidential Square. Fidel Castro spoke for 3 hours and 12 minutes.

I listened to his speech from the apartment of the editor of the Times of Havana, whose apartment overlooked the Presidential Square. With me was the late Jules DuBois—at that time Latin American correspondent for the Chicago Tribune.

It was at that point that Fidel Castro began to denounce the United States. Bear in mind that he had been in office for only 10 months.

I came away from those visits to Cuba in 1959 believing that he was not only a very dangerous man, but also one who would not bring freedom to the people of Cuba, and that he was not a man who would be helpful to democratic governments or friendly to the United States.

As the months and years went by, of course, it became obvious—and Castro finally admitted—that he was, in fact, a Communist and was throwing in his lot with the Soviet Union and was bringing communism to Cuba.

By doing that, Castro has ruined a wonderful little island, and the futures of 6 million wonderful Cubans.

To cite a converse example, I went to Poland a few years ago expecting to find oppression—but found it was not so tight a dictatorship as I had believed.

Mr. President, I cite these facts only to say I feel that the Senator from Alaska is rendering a fine service in pointing out the importance of the leaders of Government seeing at first hand the conditions as they exist in other countries throughout the world.

I should like to see more Members of Congress, more newspaper publishers, more mayors and Governors, visit not only the Soviet Union but visit also Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East. The world is getting smaller these days. In this age of jet travel we can get from one place to another very quickly. With the world shrinking in time, I believe it is important we know as much as we can about conditions as they exist in all areas of the world.

I am convinced, too, that the more the citizens of other nations see of the United States the more they will realize the advantages of democratic government and of the free enterprise system.

So while I am not prepared to endorse the specifics of the legislation introduced

November 7, 1969

Approved For Release 2002/05/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000500020002-9

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S13947

by the distinguished Senator from Alaska, I think he has rendered a service in bringing out, on the floor of the Senate, the importance of Members of Congress and other public officials seeing firsthand conditions existing elsewhere in the world.

I notice that the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) has come into the Chamber. Of all the Members of the Senate, I doubt if any other Member has traveled so widely and has gathered first hand so much information on so many countries as has the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana. I feel that his many trips have been most helpful and the reports he has made to the Senate have been most helpful to the Senate and to the Congress as a whole.

Again, I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Alaska has brought this proposal before the Senate. I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will give it careful study.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia, a very close friend of mine.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. GRAVEL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) raised the question of the prestige and standing of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER). No Member of this body or this Congress, and very few people in this country, if any, are as aware of the situation as it exists now, and has for the past decade or more, in the Soviet Union, than is the Senator from Louisiana. Few have traveled and observed more widely and thoroughly in the Soviet Union. Not only has he traveled and written reports, but he has also taken motion pictures of his journeys, in the Soviet Union and in other parts of the world.

The thing that disturbs me is that he comes back with so much valuable information and receives so little publicity and so little credit. Some of the rest of us, who do not have a fraction of the experience that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has, get more attention for our reports. I only hope that from now on the reports which the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana makes, which I believe are masterpieces, will be given more attention and study. They are worth every bit as much as or more than the reports which are put out by some of us who travel abroad.

So I am glad the Senator from Alaska has referred to the Senator from Louisiana, who has done sterling work over the years and decades, and has done so unselfishly, at great personal expense, and under most difficult circumstances.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by these words of praise. I greatly appreciate the very kind comments of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and of the distinguished majority leader.

Yesterday the Senator from Alaska sent to my office the measure that he presents today. I am in thorough accord with it. The only criticism I had of it,

as I have written him, is that he is providing for a separate congressional staff to handle this matter.

As the Senator knows, I have been opposed to the creation of many subcommittees and ad hoc groups. At the same time it is easy to see that having Members of Congress serve on such a commission would help to create support for its work in the public's mind and in the Congress itself. In any event, I hope that when the bill comes before the Senate, it is limited in its staff, because that can get into quite a bit of money and provide little accomplishment.

But, going back to the subject of Russia, as I said on returning from my last trip there, I cannot foresee world peace unless and until the suspicion that now exists between us and Russia is somewhat dissipated. As long as that fear and suspicion remain, I cannot see that world peace will prevail.

It is up to us to do what we can to work side by side with Russia, without in any manner embracing its Communist government. I believe that can be done, and I am not advocating communism, or unilateral disarmament, or anything of the sort.

As I pointed out on many occasions to the Senate, particularly in my reports of 1961 and in 1968, there is no doubt in my own mind that the seeds of free enterprise are alive and growing in Russia, and that the people there are making progress because of the incentives that have been made available to them. Economic incentives I consider to be the cornerstone of our free enterprise system. Much more food is today produced there because the farmers are being better paid.

Russia is now permitting, for instance, the ownership of homes. The government may now contribute at least 80 percent of the cost of building a home. The Russian people have to pay only 1 percent interest on whatever they borrow from the Government to construct their own homes. That is a step in the right direction.

It is my considered judgment that we should try to encourage what is going on in Russia now. The only way to do that, as I said, is to trade with them, deal with them, and have visits by people in all walks of life.

My good friend from Alaska has limited the visits to political officials, more or less. I would like to provide that people in all walks of life could come here and see what we have. I am sure, if we are able to do that, it would not take very long for the people of Russia to become envious of our democratic and free enterprise form of government. They might follow it more closely and come nearer to our way of life than the life they are pursuing. Political change is dependent upon economic and social change, particularly in such a vast and underdeveloped country such as Russia. We should do everything possible to encourage the process of change.

As I have said on many occasions, I see no possibility of destroying communism by force. We can no more destroy communism in Russia by vilifying it or by force of arms than religion can be

destroyed. Yet we have been trying for 20 years to fight Russia and destroy its form of government. Instead of destroying it, today Russia is as strong as if not stronger than, she has ever been.

I am hopeful that the contemplated visits will come to pass and that we can add to the number of exchanges between the two greatest powers in the world. I have no doubt that better relationships can be attained.

If we continue on the path we are now pursuing for the next 5 years, I believe we will destroy our own economy.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Virginia concerning the ability, the knowledge, and the valued service of the Senator from Louisiana.

I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS AND FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the adjournment of the Senate, from the conclusion of business today until noon on Monday next, all committees be authorized to file reports, including minority, individual, or supplemental views; that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President and the House of Representatives; and that the Vice President, the President pro tempore, or the Acting President pro tempore, be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider two treaties on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH BELGIUM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate Executive F, 91st Congress, first session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive F, 91st Congress, first session, the Consular Convention with Belgium, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONSULAR CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of the Belgians,

Being desirous of determining the conditions for admitting consular officers to their respective territories and of establishing their reciprocal rights, immunities, and privileges and defining their functions,

S13948

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 7, 1969

Desiring thus to facilitate the protection of nationals of each High Contracting Party in the territories of the other,

Have agreed to conclude for that purpose a Consular Convention and have designated as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

William P. Rogers, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

His Majesty the King of the Belgians: Baron Scheyven, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Belgium, Who have agreed as follows:

TITLE I—APPLICATION AND DEFINITIONS

Article 1

The territories of the High Contracting Parties to which the provisions of this Convention apply shall be understood to comprise all areas of land or water subject to the sovereignty or authority of either High Contracting Party except the Panama Canal Zone.

Article 2

As used in this Convention:

(a) the term "sending state" means the High Contracting Party by whom the consular officer is appointed;

(b) the term "receiving state" means the High Contracting Party within whose territory the consular officer performs the functions of his office and includes the states, provinces, municipalities, or other local subdivisions of which it is composed;

(c) the term "consular officer" means any person duly appointed and authorized to exercise consular functions in the receiving state as consul general, consul, vice consul, or consular agent;

(d) the term "consular employee" means an individual who, after the notification stipulated in Article 5, performs administrative or technical tasks in a consulate of the sending state;

(e) the term "consulate" means any consular establishment, whether a consulate general, consulate, vice consulate, or a consular agency;

(f) the term "consular archives" means the papers, documents, correspondence, books, films, tapes and registers of the consulate together with the ciphers and codes, the card-indexes, and any article of furniture intended for their protection or safe-keeping;

(g) the term "consular district" means the territory in the receiving state within whose limits a consular officer exercises his functions;

(h) the term "vessel", as used in Title VI of the present Convention, means any ship or craft registered under the laws of the sending state, including those owned by the sending state, with the exception of warships.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSULATES

Article 3

(1) The sending state may establish and maintain consulates at any locations agreeable to the receiving state.

(2) The limits of the consular districts shall be fixed by agreement between the sending and receiving states.

Article 4

(1) The diplomatic mission of the sending state shall notify the receiving state of the appointment or assignment of an individual as a consular officer. The document of appointment or assignment shall define the consular district.

(2) The receiving state shall issue to the head of the consulate and to other consular officers assigned thereto, as soon as possible and free of charge an exequatur or other authorization. This document shall define the consular district.

(3) As soon as the exequatur or other authorization has been received, a consular officer shall be admitted to the exercise of his functions and shall be entitled to the

benefits and be subject to the obligations of this Convention. Pending the issuance of the exequatur or other authorization, the receiving state may agree to admit him provisionally to the exercise of his functions.

(4) The exequatur or other authorization may not be refused or withdrawn except for good cause, the reasons for which need not be communicated to the sending state.

Article 5

(1) The receiving state shall be notified of the assignment of any consular employee to a consulate and shall be kept informed of his home address in the receiving state.

(2) The receiving state may refuse or, at any time, cease to recognize an individual as a consular employee. In such event the sending state shall, as the case may be, either recall the individual concerned or terminate his functions at the consulate.

Article 6

The sending state may, with the consent of the receiving state, designate one or more members of its diplomatic mission accredited to the receiving state to perform consular functions in addition to diplomatic functions. Such a designation must be made in conformity with the provisions of this Convention. Individuals so designated shall be entitled to the benefits and be subject to the obligations of this Convention, without prejudice to such privileges and immunities to which they may be entitled by virtue of being members of the diplomatic mission of the sending state.

TITLE III—GENERAL RIGHTS, IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES

Article 7

(1) A consular officer shall be entitled to the respect and high consideration of the authorities of the receiving state with whom he comes in contact in the performance of his functions.

(2) The receiving state shall take all appropriate steps to ensure the protection of consulates and residences of consular officers.

Article 8

(1) A consular officer or consular employee shall not be amenable to the jurisdiction of the judicial or administrative authorities of the receiving state in respect of acts performed in the exercise of consular functions, except as provided in paragraph (4) of Article 32.

(2) A consular officer or consular employee shall be exempt in the receiving state from arrest or prosecution except when he has been charged with the commission of an offense under the laws of the receiving state which, upon conviction, would subject the individual guilty thereof to a sentence of imprisonment of at least one year.

(3) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this Article shall not apply in respect of a civil action either:

(a) arising out of a contract concluded by a consular officer or a consular employee in which he did not contract expressly or impliedly as an agent of the sending state; or

(b) by a third party for damage arising from an accident in the receiving state caused by a vehicle, vessel or aircraft.

(4) The sending state and its consular officers and consular employees shall comply with any requirement imposed by the laws and regulations of the receiving state with respect to insurance against third party risks arising from the use of any vehicle, vessel or aircraft.

(5) The authorities of the receiving state shall notify without delay the diplomatic mission of the sending state whenever a consular officer or consular employee has been arrested or detained.

Article 9

(1) A consular officer or consular employee shall, upon the request of the administrative or judicial authorities of the receiving state, appear in court for the purpose of giving

testimony. The administrative or judicial authorities requiring such testimony shall take all reasonable steps to avoid interference with the performance of his consular functions and wherever possible arrange for the taking of such testimony, orally or in writing, at the consulate or residence of the consular officer or consular employee.

(2) A consular officer or consular employee shall have the right to refuse a request from the administrative or judicial authorities of the receiving state to produce any documents or articles from the consular archives or to give testimony relating to matters connected with the exercise of consular functions. Such a request, however, shall be complied with the interests of justice if it is possible to do so without prejudicing the interests of the sending state.

Article 10

The sending state may waive, with regard to a consular officer or consular employee, any of the privileges and immunities provided for in this Convention. The waiver shall be express and shall be communicated to the receiving state in writing.

Article 11

(1) Consular archives shall be inviolable, and the authorities of the receiving state shall not, on any pretext, examine or seize the documents or articles of which they are composed.

(2) The archives shall be kept completely separate from the documents and objects having nothing to do with the performance of consular functions.

Article 12

The authorities of the receiving state shall not enter that part of the consular premises which is used exclusively for the work of the consulate except with the consent of the head of the consulate or of his designee or of the head of the diplomatic mission of the sending state. The consent of the head of the consulate may, however, be assumed in case of fire or other disaster requiring prompt protective action.

Article 13

(1) A consular officer or consular employee and members of his family forming part of his household shall be exempt in the receiving state from any requirements with regard to the registration of aliens and the obtaining of permission to reside, and shall not be subject to deportation. Such members of the family of a consular officer or consular employee shall not receive the benefits of this paragraph if they carry on any private gainful occupation in the receiving state.

(2) An appropriate identification document may be issued by the competent authorities of the receiving state to the persons entitled to the benefits of this Article.

(3) The receiving state shall, if required by its laws or regulations, be notified:

(a) of the arrival of consulate officers and consular employees after they have been assigned to a consulate, as well as of their final departure from the receiving state or of the termination of their functions in the consulate;

(b) of the arrival in and final departure from the receiving state of members of the family forming part of the household of consular officers and consular employees and, if applicable, of the fact that such an individual joins their household or leaves it;

(c) of the arrival in and final departure from the receiving state of private staff members who are not nationals of that state and are in the sole employ of consular officers and, if necessary, of the fact that they are entering their service or leaving it;

(d) of the hiring and termination of functions in a consulate of consular employees engaged in the receiving state.

Article 14

A consular officer or consular employee shall enjoy exemption from military, naval,